

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on 01 July 2011. **Claims 53-55, 57-65, 67-73, and 75-80** are now pending in the present application and **claims 1-52, 56, 66, and 74** are canceled. This office action is made **Final**.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The information disclosure statement(s) (IDS) submitted on
  - a. 21 September 2011

is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97 and is being considered by the examiner.

The IDS (see item 2a) included reference document(s) that was/were lined through (or crossed-out) and have not been considered by the Examiner. Reasons for not considering the documents are at the least the following:

- i. The IDS failed to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2)(i).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 53-55, 61, 63-65, 71-73, and 79** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kolev et al.** (hereinafter Kolev) (US 6,125,283) in view of **Kaplan** (US 5,884,193).

Regarding **claim 53**, Kolev discloses a method of communications, comprising: receiving, at a communications device, an origination request for a call (see col. 6, lines 28-34; col. 8, lines 8-11; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 5-6B), including parameters that include a dialing string (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36; Figs. 4-5 and 6B “ref. 130, 128”), where the user terminal (60) has an user interface (70) for input dialing numbers (e.g., string);

identifying a plurality of communications networks (20, 40) supported by the communications device (see col. 6, lines 18-28, 36-41,44-49; col. 6, line 61 - col. 7, line 8; Fig. 5), where the dual-mode mobile terminal is able to communicate with a satellite network (40) and/or a terrestrial network (20 - GSM or AMPS) according to service parameters (e.g., compatibility, level of service, and/or type of communications) (see col. 5, line 52 - col. 6, line 13; col. 9, lines 2-5,20-23; Figs. 5-6B);

determining whether the dialing string indicates an emergency number and, if the dialing string indicates an emergency number generating a first marking indicating that the call is

allowed on each of the plurality of communications networks without regard to any user-defined permission information to indicate (see col. 8, lines 5-13; col. 9, lines 24-29,53-54,61-66);

if the dialing string does not indicate an emergency number, accessing, for each of the plurality of communications networks, user-defined permission information and comparing the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the call is allowed or is not allowed on each of the identified communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 6, lines 32-49; col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 8; Figs. 4), where the user terminal (60) accesses information stored in memory (68) and SIM (72), and where the network processes the call request of the user terminal (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36,50-54; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B) and the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9);

originating the call on a respective one of the plurality of communications networks if the call was determined to be allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 11, lines 5-8; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B), where the network processes the call request of the user terminal,

wherein the user-defined permission information comprises at least one of phone number allowed or phone number not allowed (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9), where the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks and to permit calls such as an emergency (see col. 11, lines 1-9). Kolev does not specifically disclose having the

feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network or a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network or a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device was well known in the art, as taught by Kaplan.

In the same field of endeavor, Kaplan discloses the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 2-20) or

a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 21-33),

wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card (e.g., 104, 130) within the communication device (e.g., 100) (see col. 5, lines 5-8,21-23; Fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kolev and Kaplan to have the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network or a block list indicating one or more phone

numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device, in order to provide a system and method for call restrictions that are implemented by the wireless communication device, as taught by Kaplan (see col. 1, lines 51-53).

Regarding **claim 61**, Kolev discloses a method of communications, comprising: receiving, at a communications device, an origination request for a call (see col. 6, lines 28-34; col. 8, lines 8-11; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 5-6B), including parameters that include a dialing string (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36; Figs. 4-5 and 6B “ref. 130, 128”), where the user terminal (60) has an user interface (70) for input dialing numbers (e.g., string);

identifying a plurality of communications networks (20, 40) supported by the communications device (see col. 6, lines 18-28, 36-41,44-49; col. 6, line 61 - col. 7, line 8; Fig. 5), where the dual-mode mobile terminal is able to communicate with a satellite network (40) and/or a terrestrial network (20 - GSM or AMPS) according to service parameters (e.g., compatibility, level of service, and/or type of communications) (see col. 5, line 52 - col. 6, line 13; col. 9, lines 2-5,20-23; Figs. 5-6B);

determining whether the dialing string indicates an emergency number and, if the dialing indicates an emergency number, generating a first marking indicating that the call is allowed on each of the plurality of communications networks without regard to any user-defined permission information to indicate (see col. 8, lines 5-13; col. 9, lines 24-29,53-54,61-66); if the dialing string does not indicate an emergency number, accessing, for each of the

plurality of communications networks, user-defined permission information and comparing the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the call is allowed or is not allowed on each of the identified communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 6, lines 32-49; col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 8; Figs. 4), where the user terminal (60) accesses information stored in memory (68) and SIM (72) and, where the network processes the call request of the user terminal (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36,50-54; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B), and where the network access is not allowed or blocked (see col. 7, lines 22-29; col. 8, lines 49-59; col. 11, lines 8-9; Figs. 6A, 6B “ref. 134, 126”) and the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user’s preference to allow for access to different networks (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9);

preventing the call from being originated on a respective one of the plurality of communications networks if the call was determined to be not allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks and if the dialing string does not indicate the emergency number (see col. 7, lines 22-29; col. 8, lines 49-59; col. 11, lines 8-9; Figs. 6A, 6B “ref. 134, 126”), where the network access is not allowed or blocked; and

wherein the user-defined permission information comprises at least one of an allowed phone number, or a blocked number (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9), where the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user’s preference to allow for access to different networks and to permit calls such as an emergency (see col. 11, lines 1-9). Kolev does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers

allowed on a particular communications network, or a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network, or a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device was well known in the art, as taught by Kaplan.

In the same field of endeavor, Kaplan discloses the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 2-20), or

a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 21-33),

wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card (e.g., 104, 130) within the communication device (e.g., 100) (see col. 5, lines 5-8,21-23; Fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kolev and Kaplan to have the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network, or a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed

dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device, in order to provide a system and method for call restrictions that are implemented by the wireless communication device, as taught by Kaplan (see col. 1, lines 51-53).

Regarding **claim 63**, Kolev discloses a computer readable media embodying a program of instructions executable by a processor to perform a method of communications (see Figs. 4-6B), the method comprising:

receiving, at a communications device, an origination request for a call (see col. 6, lines 28-34; col. 8, lines 8-11; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 5-6B), including parameters that include a dialing string (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36; Figs. 4-5 and 6B “ref. 130, 128”), where the user terminal (60) has an user interface (70) for input dialing numbers (e.g., string);

identifying a plurality of communications networks (20, 40) supported by the communications device (see col. 6, lines 18-28, 36-41,44-49; col. 6, line 61 - col. 7, line 8; Fig. 5), where the dual-mode mobile terminal is able to communicate with a satellite network (40) and/or a terrestrial network (20 - GSM or AMPS) according to service parameters (e.g., compatibility, level of service, and/or type of communications) (see col. 5, line 52 - col. 6, line 13; col. 9, lines 2-5,20-23; Figs. 5-6B);

determining whether the dialing string indicates an emergency number and, and if the dialing string indicates an emergency number, generating a first marking indicating that the call is allowed on each of the plurality of communications networks without regard to any user-defined permission information to indicate (see col. 8, lines 5-13; col. 9, lines 24-29,53-

54,61-66);

if the dialing string does not indicate an emergency number, accessing, for each of the plurality of communications networks, user-defined permission information and comparing the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the call is allowed or is not allowed on each of the identified communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 6, lines 32-49; col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 8; Figs. 4), where the user terminal (60) accesses information stored in memory (68) and SIM (72) and, where the network processes the call request of the user terminal (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36,50-54; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B) and the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9), and originating the call over a respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) if the call is determined to be allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) and if the dialing string does not indicate the emergency number (see col. 11, lines 5-8; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B), where the network processes the call request of the user terminal, and

preventing the call from being originating if the call is determined not to be allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 7, lines 22-29; col. 8, lines 49-59; col. 11, lines 8-9; Figs. 6A, 6B "ref. 134, 126"), where the network (20, 40) access is not allowed or blocked,

wherein the user-defined permission information comprises at least one of phone number allowed or phone number not allowed (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines

Art Unit: 2617

3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9), where the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks and to permit calls such as an emergency (see col. 11, lines 1-9). Kolev does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network or a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network or a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device was well known in the art, as taught by Kaplan.

In the same field of endeavor, Kaplan discloses the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 2-20) or

a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 21-33),

wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card (e.g., 104, 130) within the communication device (e.g., 100) (see col. 5, lines 5-8,21-23; Fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kolev and Kaplan to have the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network or a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device, in order to provide a system and method for call restrictions that are implemented by the wireless communication device, as taught by Kaplan (see col. 1, lines 51-53).

Regarding **claim 71**, Kolev discloses a user terminal (60) which reads on claimed “communications device” (see col. 6, 18-22; Figs. 4-6B), comprising:

an user interface (70) which reads on the claimed “input device” configured to receive an origination request for a call (see col. 6, lines 28-36; col. 8, lines 8-11; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 4-6B), including parameters that include a dialing string (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36; Figs. 4-5 and 6B “ref. 130, 128”), where the user terminal (60) has an user interface (70) for input dialing numbers (e.g., string);

an user terminal memory (68) which reads on the claimed “memory device” for storing information user-defined permission information for each of a plurality of communications networks supported by the communication device (see col. 6, lines 32-34; Fig. 4), where the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user’s preference to allow for access to different networks (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9),

wherein the respective user-defined information is different for at least two of the

plurality of communications networks (see col. 6, lines 32-49; col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 8; Figs. 4), where the user terminal (60) accesses information stored in memory (68) and SIM (72) and, where the network processes the call request of the user terminal (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36,50-54; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B) and the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9);

a processor (66) (see Fig. 4) configured to:

identifying a plurality of communications networks (20, 40) supported by the communications device (see col. 6, lines 18-28, 36-41,44-49; col. 6, line 61 - col. 7, line 8; Fig. 5), where the dual-mode mobile terminal is able to communicate with a satellite network (40) and/or a terrestrial network (20 - GSM or AMPS) according to service parameters (e.g., compatibility, level of service, and/or type of communications) (see col. 5, line 52 - col. 6, line 13; col. 9, lines 2-5,20-23; Figs. 5-6B);

determine whether the dialing string indicates an emergency number and, if the dialing string indicates an emergency number, generate a first marking indicating that the call is allowed on each of the plurality of communications networks without regard to any user-defined permission information to indicate (see col. 8, lines 5-13; col. 9, lines 24-29,53-54,61-66);

if the dialing string does not indicate an emergency number, access, for each of the plurality of communications networks, the user-defined permission information and comparing the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the

call is allowed or is not allowed on each of the identified communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 6, lines 32-49; col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 8; Figs. 4), where the user terminal (60) accesses information stored in memory (68) and SIM (72) and, where the network processes the call request of the user terminal (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36,50-54; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B) and the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9); originating the call over a respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) if the processor determines that the call is allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 11, lines 5-8; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B), where the network processes the call request of the user terminal; prevent the call from being originating over the respective one of the plurality of communications network (20, 40) if the processor determines that the call is not allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) and if the dialing string does not indicate the emergency number (see col. 7, lines 22-29; col. 8, lines 49-59; col. 11, lines 8-9; Figs. 6A, 6B "ref. 134, 126"), where the network access is not allowed or blocked; and wherein the user-defined permission information comprises at least one of an allowed phone number or blocked phone number (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9), where the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks and to permit calls such as an emergency (see col. 11, lines 1-9). Kolev does not specifically disclose

having the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network or a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network or a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device was well known in the art, as taught by Kaplan.

In the same field of endeavor, Kaplan discloses the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 2-20) or

a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 21-33),

wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card (e.g., 104, 130) within the communication device (e.g., 100) (see col. 5, lines 5-8,21-23; Fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kolev and Kaplan to have the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network or a block list indicating one or more phone

numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device, in order to provide a system and method for call restrictions that are implemented by the wireless communication device, as taught by Kaplan (see col. 1, lines 51-53).

Regarding **claim 79**, Kolev discloses a user terminal (60) which reads on claimed “communications device” (see col. 6, 18-22; Figs. 4-6B), comprising:

means (66) for receiving an origination request for a call, including parameters that include a dialing string (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36; Figs. 4-5 and 6B “ref. 130, 128”), where the user terminal (60) has an user interface (70) for input dialing numbers (e.g., string);

means (66) for identifying a plurality of communications networks (20, 40) supported by the communications device (see col. 6, lines 18-28, 36-41,44-49; col. 6, line 61 - col. 7, line 8; Fig. 5), where the dual-mode mobile terminal is able to communicate with a satellite network (40) and/or a terrestrial network (20 - GSM or AMPS) according to service parameters (e.g., compatibility, level of service, and/or type of communications) (see col. 5, line 52 - col. 6, line 13; col. 9, lines 2-5,20-23; Figs. 5-6B);

means for determining whether the dialing string indicates an emergency number and, if the dialing string indicates an emergency number, generating a first marking indicating that the call is allowed on each of the plurality of communications networks if the dialing string indicates an emergency number (see col. 8, lines 5-13; col. 9, lines 24-29,53-54,61-66);

means (66) for, if the dialing string does not indicate an emergency number, accessing,

for each of the plurality of communications networks, the user-defined permission information and comparing the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the call is allowed or is not allowed on each of the identified communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 6, lines 32-49; col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 8; Figs. 4), where the user terminal (60) accesses information stored in memory (68) and SIM (72) and, where the network processes the call request of the user terminal (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36,50-54; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B) and the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9); means (66) for originating the call over a respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) if the call is determined to be allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 11, lines 5-8; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B), where the network processes the call request of the user terminal; means (66) for preventing the call over the respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) if the call is determined not to be allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) and if the dialing string does not indicate the emergency number (see col. 7, lines 22-29; col. 8, lines 49-59; col. 11, lines 8-9; Figs. 6A, 6B "ref. 134, 126"), where the network access is not allowed or blocked; and wherein the user-defined permission information comprises at least one of phone number allowed or phone number not allowed (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9), where the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to

services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks and to permit calls such as an emergency (see col. 11, lines 1-9). Kolev does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network or a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network or a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device was well known in the art, as taught by Kaplan.

In the same field of endeavor, Kaplan discloses the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 2-20) or

a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 21-33),

wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card (e.g., 104, 130) within the communication device (e.g., 100) (see col. 5, lines 5-8,21-23; Fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kolev and Kaplan to have the feature(s)

comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network or a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device, in order to provide a system and method for call restrictions that are implemented by the wireless communication device, as taught by Kaplan (see col. 1, lines 51-53).

Regarding **claim 54, 64, and 72**, the combination of Kolev and Kaplan discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claims 53, 63, & 71), in addition Kolev further discloses the method of claims 53, computer readable media of claim 63, and communications device of claims 71, at least a portion of the user-defined permission information is accessed from at least one of a SIM card, an R-UIM card, and a USIM card (see col. 6, lines 1-9).

Regarding **claims 55, 65, and 73**, the combination of Kolev and Kaplan discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claims 53, 63, & 71), in addition Kolev further discloses the method of claim 53, computer readable media of claim 63, and communications device of claim 71 wherein the call origination request comprises an indication that the call is an emergency call (see col. 8, lines 5-13).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. **Claims 57, 62, 67, 75, and 80** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
5. In view of the objection for claims 57, 67, and 75, claims 58-60, 68-70, and 76-78 would be allowable.

***Reasons For Allowance***

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:
  - a. Regarding **claims 57, 62, 67, 75, and 80**, the combination of the applied references fails to disclose or render obvious the features of the claims.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 01 July 2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's arguments as the applied reference(s) provide more than adequate support and to further clarify (see the above claims for relevant citations and comments in this section).

8. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "...subscriber identification information stored in a **SIM card** can be manipulated or **programmed by each individual user...**" - pg. 15, 2<sup>nd</sup> full par.) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regarding applicant's argument of the claim 53 (see above), the applicant's argument relies on a feature(s) indicated above that is not articulated in the claim(s).

Furthermore, if applicant considers the language to be supported see the following:

Regarding applicant's argument of claim 53 on pg. 18, 1<sup>st</sup> - 2<sup>nd</sup> full par., "...user-defined permission information comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network or a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communication network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a **communications card** within the communications device...", the Examiner respectfully

disagrees. Applicant has failed to interpret and appreciate the combined teachings of well-known prior art Kolev and Kaplan that clearly discloses the claimed feature(s) as would be clearly recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art. As a note, **none** of the claims **articulate** that the communications card (e.g., claim 53, line 21) is the same card as the SIM card (e.g., claim 54, line 2). In particular, Kolev discloses the language as related to the claimed feature(s)

wherein the user-defined permission information comprises at least one of phone number allowed or phone number not allowed { (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9), where the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks and to permit calls such as an emergency (see col. 11, lines 1-9), and where the user terminal (60) accesses information stored in memory (68) and SIM (72) (see col. 6, lines 32-49; col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 8; Figs. 4) }.

As further support in the same field of endeavor, Kaplan discloses the language as related to the claimed feature(s)

comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network { (see col. 5, lines 2-20), where the system enables transmission to user selected telephone numbers that are stored in the speed dialing storage location designated as the override data storage area (128) } or

a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network { (see col. 5, lines 21-33), where the system stores user selected telephone numbers in a restricted number storage area (e.g., 130) to disable transmission },

wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card (e.g., 104) within the communication device (e.g., 100) { (see col. 5, lines 5-9,21-23; Fig. 1) }. Therefore, the combination(s) of the reference(s) Kolev and Kaplan as addressed above more than adequately meets the claim limitations.

9. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Regarding applicant's argument of claim 53 on pg. 15, 2<sup>nd</sup> full par., “...silent...generating a first marking indicating that the call is allowed on each of the plurality of communications network if the dialing string indicates an emergency number...”, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant has failed to interpret and appreciate the combined teachings of well-known prior art Kolev and Kaplan that clearly discloses the claimed feature(s) as would be clearly recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art. In particular, Kolev discloses the language as related to the claimed feature(s)

determining whether the dialing string indicates an emergency number and, if the dialing string indicates an emergency number generating a first marking indicating that the call is allowed on each of the plurality of communications networks without regard to any user-defined permission information to indicate (see col. 8, lines 5-13; col. 9, lines 24-29,53-54,61-66), where an emergency call is allowed on either the terrestrial or satellite network in which the first marking would be implied as evidenced by the fact that one of ordinary skill

in the art would clearly recognize that there must be an indication to allow an emergency call by determining that a telephone number is an emergency number.

As further support in the same field of endeavor, Kaplan discloses the language as related to the claimed feature(s)

generating a first marking indicating that the call is allowed on each of the plurality of communications network if the dialing string indicates an emergency number { (see col. 10, lines 10-14), where the system overrides call restrictions to allow an emergency call }.

Therefore, the combination(s) of the reference(s) Kolev and Kaplan as addressed above more than adequately meets the claim limitations.

10. Regarding applicant's argument of claim 53 on pg. 16, 6<sup>th</sup> full par., "...comparing the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the call is allowed or is not allowed on each of the identified communications networks...", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant has failed to interpret and appreciate the combined teachings of well-known prior art Kolev and Kaplan that clearly discloses the claimed feature(s) as would be clearly recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art. In particular, Kolev discloses the language as related to the claimed feature(s)

comparing the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the call is allowed or is not allowed on each of the identified communications networks (20, 40) { (see col. 6, lines 32-49; col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 8; Figs. 4), where the user terminal (60) accesses information stored in memory (68) and SIM (72), and where the network processes the call request of the user terminal (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36,50-54; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B) and the user (or subscriber) has

subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9), for example, the user (or subscriber) agrees to subscription terms, plan, or agreement }.

As further support in the same field of endeavor, Kaplan discloses the language as related to the claimed feature(s)

comparing the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the call is allowed or is not allowed on each of the identified communications networks { (see col. 4, lines 7-10), where the system analyzes digits, and the CPU compares user selected calling restrictions (see col. 4, lines 39-42), and the system enables transmission to user selected telephone numbers that are stored in the speed dialing storage location designated as the override data storage area (128) of memory (e.g., 104) (see col. 5, lines 2-20), and the system stores user selected telephone numbers in a restricted number storage area (e.g., 130) to disable transmission (see col. 5, lines 21-33) }. Therefore, the combination(s) of the reference(s) Kolev and Kaplan as addressed above more than adequately meets the claim limitations.

11. The language of the restricted claims filed 20 November 2009 was included in the response filed on 14 May 2010.

12. Regarding applicant's argument(s) of claims 54-55, 61, 63-65, 71-73, and 79, the claims are addressed for the same reasons as set forth above and as applied above in each claim rejection.

***Conclusion***

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
  - a. Cirul et al. (US 2002/0098874 A1) discloses a cellular telephone with programmable authorized telephone number.
14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIE J. DANIEL JR whose telephone number is (571)272-7907. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on (571) 272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/WILLIE J DANIEL JR/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2617

WJD,Jr  
24 October 2011